Development works in Hoskote and Anekal Taluks.

Q.—494. Sri H. T. PUTTAPPA (*Hoskote-Anekal*—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the reason for the delay in taking up the development work of public utility in Hoskote and Anekal taluks;

(*b*) whether they would instruct the concerned officers now at least to carry out the development works of Public utility in those taluks ?

A.— Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—

(*a*) No cases of delay are brought to notice of Government.

(*b*) General instructions have been issued to all the officers to have the works carried out as early as possible.

PRVILEGE MOTION

Re : **Early Publication of the Budget "Daily Post"**

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Chair has received one privilege motion yesterday. What does the Hon'ble Member intend to do ?

A MEMBER.—Please read out the motion, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—

"Under S. 173 of the Rules of Procedure I beg to draw your attention to a matter of privilege. The Budget proposals for 1955-56 which were presented to this House at 2-30 p.m. to-day have been printed and published in the "Daily Post" bearing today's date and sold even before Hon'ble Members of this House have been supplied with the Budget papers at 3-30 p.m. The newspaper has obtained the Budget papers even before the proposals have been presented to the House. This is evident from the editorial article in the paper. The paper was being sold at 3 p.m. near the House. This constitutes a breach of privilege of the House and I request that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges".

1 P.M.

*Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—The notice of motion which you have been pleased to read to this House and which was given yesterday contains a brief statement of what actually occurred yesterday afternoon and when I raised this matter at 3-40 p.m. yesterday when the Deputy Speaker happened to occupy the Chair, I raised it by means of an oral representation and said that the text of the budget speech and the text of the budget proposals which had been placed before the House between 1 and 2-30 p.m. yesterday, had been printed in an English Daily Paper, which had also written an editorial upon it extending to nearly two columns and I also produced a copy of that Paper which was being sold on the premises of the Assembly earlier in the course of the afternoon and which had been purchased by a friend of mine, who is also an Hon'ble Member of the Assembly and who passed it on to me. It occurred to me that the publication of the text of the budget proposals as well as the writing of an editorial upon it ought to take some time and it seemed to me that the printing of the text as well as the printing of the editorial that had been written upon it, must have taken a little more time than was apparent from the manner in which the matter had been published. Essentially, it appeared to me to be a matter of privilege touching the rights of this House because article 202 of the Constitution, which provides that an annual financial statement which we refer to as the budget shall be placed before the House of Legislature or the Houses of Legislature or an annual financial statement shall be caused to be placed before the House of Legislature by the Governor, would seem to mean that this budget or the annual financial statement is a thing which must be presented first to the Legislature as such and the members of the House of Legislature to which it should be presented unde

*Asterisk Indicates that the speech has not been revised by the Member concerned.

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

Article 202 have an unqualified right of precedence in the matter of access to the contents of the annual financial statement or the budget proposals. That being so, when the Paper was being sold at 3 p. m. and contained all the matter that I have already referred to, it occurred to me that the person who is responsible for the printing and the publication of that Paper or the writing of that editorial must have been able to get at the matter with which he dealt with earlier than Hon'ble Members of this House. You would be able to remember that copies of the budget papers were actually distributed to the members of this House when the House reassembled after the Tea interval at half past Three. Copies were handed over to us at half past Three and while I was looking through some of those papers, I found that this neswpaper had found its way into the House and was to be found in the hands of many Hon'ble Members and it was then that I raised this matter and the Deputy Speaker was pleased to ask me whether I would put it down in writing so that he might deal with it. Then I wrote it down and I have cited a reference to rule 173 of our Rules of Procedure. Any matter of privilege in my opinion is essentially for this House to deal with and to deal with in such manner as it thinks fit and you, Sir, as the custodian of the rights and privileges of this House have to be informed when any matter touching the privilege of this House needs to be brought to your attention. I have taken the earliest possible opportunity of inviting your attention to what I considered to be a matter of privilege and have put it down in writing and handed it over together with the Paper which is the subject-matter of this privilege matter. Any motion for referring this matter for investigation or examination or enquiry or anything-any such motion can be made either by the Speaker himself under rule 174 of our Rules of Procedure or under 173, subclause (4) perhaps by the Leader of the House who, I take it and I am certain of it, is no less concerned and is no less anxious than any other member of the House to uphold, safeguard and protect the rights and privileges of this House. I find that the budget books which consist of three parts, not to mention the budget speech of the Finance Minister himself—those three Parts have been printed on different dates. Volume II of the budget papers relating to development schemes of the Government for the year 1955-56, I find, has been printed on the 1st March 1955 and Volume I of the budget proposals has been printed on the 2nd March 1955. The Budget Memorandum has been printed on the 3rd March 1955 as also the Hon'ble the Finance Minister's speech has been printed at the Government Press on the 3rd March. All these papers were presented to the House yesterday, that is, 3rd March and it is not quite clear to me how a substantial part of the matter contained in these books or in these budget proposals or in the budget speech of Hon'ble the Finance Minister could be reproduced in such a short time in a newspaper press unless he has had special means of expediting the printing and the publishing of the matter to which he got access in the usual course if he did. Therefore, I felt that I owed it to myself as a member of this House as well as to this House collectively and more specially to the Speaker and to the Leader of the House to bring this matter touching the prestige of the House, to the attention of the Chair and I have done so and I leave it there. I have nothing more to add.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Shall we have a clarification from the Finance Minister and then we will be able to. . . .

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Chief Minister).-It is not a matter for discussion. I will be able to clarify matters once for all, instead of a debate taking place thereon. Let everybody who wants to speak speak and I will have my say.

***Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.**—From what I have heard from Sri Rama Rao's account, I feel this is a matter worth investigating. It is a well known fact that no budget proposals or, as a matter of fact, anything contained in the budget should leak out or should become

the public property till it is presented before the Legislature. But curiously, it has so happened that an important Paper in Bangalore has published the various proposals contained in the budget and copies of the Paper were sold and according to the circumstances explained by Sri Rama Rao, it looks that there has been divulgence of the budget proposals and presuming that the budget proposals and budget copies have been given in advance to the Editor or a printer of the Paper, the question arises: is the Government authorised to give advance copies to the Editors and is it right, or was the Press so efficient as to print the entire budget proposals within the short time as mentioned by Sri Rama Rao? So I feel this is a matter worth investigating. First of all, did the Government divulge the secrets and give advance copies to the Press and to the editor and, if so, to how many Papers were these copies given in advance and secondly, is the Government authorised to give these copies in advance and does it not amount to the leakage of the budget proposals—these are very important matters which concern the dignity and privilege of the House. The third point that arises is : before the copies are distributed in the House and before members are in possession of the copies, is it left to the Government to distribute the copies to others who are not connected with the Legislature? These are various points that have to be thrashed out. This is the first time that such an occasion has arisen. To build up conventions and in the future interests of the State, this is a matter which is to be referred to the Privileges Committee so that the entire thing may be thrashed out and necessary action taken for the future.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I would like to add one or two words to what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I would like to draw the attention of the Chair to article 202 of the Constitution :

> "(1) The Governor shall in respect of every financial year cause to be laid before the House or Houses of the Legislature of the State, a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the State for that year, in this Part referred to as the 'annual financial statement'.
>
> (2) The estimates of expenditure embodied in the annual financial statement shall show separately. . ."

So, by virtue of art. 202 of the Constitution, the members of the Legislature—the members of the Legislative Assembly as well as the members of the Legislative Council are entitled to know the financial budget proposals for the coming year. As we are all aware, the Finance Minister placed the budget proposals yesterday at 1 p.m. He who is the author of this speech took about 90 minutes to read out the speech at a fairly rapid rate and at 3-30 p.m. the budget proposals were placed before the Legislative Council. By about 3 p.m. or near about that time some extracts of the speech along with a lengthy editorial appeared in one of the Papers in Bangalore City—"Daily Post". We all know that the "Daily Post" does not possess any up-to-date printing machinery, either a rotary press or linotype machines which other Papers, for example "New York Herald", possess. In Bangalore, and for that matter, in the State of Mysore, we have got only one Press which has got a reputation and which can do very rapid composing and printing work. I would like to read extracts from the "Deccan Herald" regarding the Deccan Herald Press.

> 'Take the case of 'Deccan Herald', please. You will search the whole of the Mysore State to discover a better equipped press especially designed for speedy setting and printing. It is a matter of pride that we also possess a few of the best lino-operators in the country, not to speak of other human material that go to compose the structure of an efficiently run newspaper. Even so, our summary was not ready before 5 p.m. Thereafter, type-setting, page make-up and printing that carried on much beyond 7 p.m. It is sheer

impertinence to suggest that the bullock-cart could race faster than the jet-bomber."

When such is the case, it is doubtful how this Daily Post could compose a matter spreading over seven to eight columns and write up an editorial within such a short time. It is therefore obvious that the Representative of this newspaper should have been in possession of the speech much earlier than the members of this House. When a similar case arose in England—now and then we will be referring to the Mother of Parliaments. . .

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—That also is done.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Mr. Dalton, the then Chancellor for Exchequer, who had indiscretely leaked out some Budget proposals, had to resign gracefully from his post. May I now ask the Finance Minister to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Dalton? Sir, as I have already made out a case that this Paper's representative must have been in possession of this budget speech much before the members of this Assembly came to know of this speech, the privileges and rights of this august House have been curtailed, have been abrogated by the way in which this speech has been publicised in the *Daily Post*. I therefore suggest that a clear breach of privilege has arisen and it is a fit case to be referred to the Privileges Committee.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—Sir, very rarely, we come across with such instances wherein the budget proposals of any Finance Minister would get publication earlier than the members should have access to the speech itself. Probably this is the first instance that such a thing has occurred in the State of Mysore. The facts about this matter are there; one important factor touching the very privilege of this House has arisen, and that is, the editor of the Paper in question has had the Budget speech at least earlier than the time when the members were in possession of the copies. Well, any way, this particular fact needs a thorough investigation, as it touches the privileges of this august House. I believe no member of this House will view this motion from party point of view. Because, the privilege of each and every member of this House cannot be and should not be viewed from party point of view. Therefore, I submit that this motion should be referred to the Privileges Committee and the whole matter thoroughly investigated into. Here, I do not suggest by whom the fault has been committed. It is for the Privileges Committee to go into this question in detail and see who has committed the fault and what are the consequences that would accrue. Well, as matter is of paramount importance which touches the privileges and rights of each and every one of the members of this House, I believe that the Leader of this House, who is championing the cause of democratic precedents, will also agree that the motion should be sent to the Privileges Committee and that it should be examined. I have full confidence that what he would say, he would practise. With this confidence, I am of the opinion that the publication in that particular newspaper ' the ' Daily Post' of the Budget proposals contained in the speech of the Finance Minister before the members had access to the contents of the speech does involve a privilege question. As such, I submit that the matter should be coolly and thoroughly investigated by the Privileges Committee.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Sir, if a breach of privilege has been committed, it ought to be pursued and investigated. I have no difference of opinion regarding the enunciation of that principle. The issue is whether a breach has been committed. Sir, Sri Rama Rao's motion makes it clear that he got the Paper, being sold at 3-00 P.M. near the House. That is what he says. As the House is aware, by 2-30 P.M. the speech had become public property. I wish the Hon'ble Members to take note of this fact dispassionately. Sri Linganna said that it should not be viewed as a party question. That is a correct stand.

It has been viewed by one member as a party question and as an opportunity for him to oust this Ministry. It is not such an easy task.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Said by your own party men.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—I want you to consider this aspect from a legal point of view and not from the political point of view. That is what I was saying. When the speech became public property at 2-30 P.M., if half-a-dozen members in the lobbies or down below were discussing the contents of this speech, would it be a matter of privilege ? Suppose my speeeh had been recorded and played on record or tape-recorder at 2-35 P.M., five minutes after I delivered the speech, would it be a breach of privilege ? As soon as a speech becomes public matter, it does not matter how people repeat it. Whether they repeat it orally or they repeat it by machine like recording of the speech on dictaphone and equipments like that, it does not matter. I am sure, the Hon'ble Members themselves would say that it would not be a breach of privilege if some members read the very speech outside or inside the House after 2-30 P.M. Sir, considered purely from the legal point of view and not as some members want to consider it from the political point of view, at 2-30 P.M. it has become public property. In fact, the convention in this House was, even at 1-10 P.M. when the speech was begun to be read, copies were being distributed to the Press. That has been the practice in this House, not this year, but from a very very long time. Even according to the motion before us, we need not take into consideration what happened at 1-10 P.M. or even at 1-30 P.M., but what has really happened after 2-30 P.M., *i.e.*, by which time the budget speech had become public property. My friend Sri Rama Rao entertained doubts by way of inference. He says that between 1-10 P.M. and 3 o'clock, within two hours, or a little less than 2 hours, how can the speech be printed and an editorial written and that therefore this speech must have been placed in the hands of the editor or the printer by some one and hence it may be a matter of privilege. This is a matter of mere inference. It is not a matter for consideration. It is not a matter of allegation. I do not say it is a motion. He says that he has brought this to the notice of the Speaker. If there is an allegation that he or somebody else saw a copy of the speech being handed over to the concerned printer or editor, that is a matter for investigation. No such specific allegation is made. Merely because an editorial has been written an inference has been drawn that the speech must have reached the hands of the printer or the editor before one o'clock. That is too far-fetched an inference Whether an editor or printer could print a portion of the speech within two hours is a matter left to the printer. It depends upon his equipment, upon his resources and upon the quickness with which he does his work. But to draw an inference from circumstances which have not been proved do not make out a *prima facie* case.

1-30 P.M.

After I came to know this write-up, I made enquiries. I learnt that it is possible within the course of onehour and forty or fifty minutes, as the case may be, to print this portion of the speech. In fact, the *bona fides* is proved when we look at the print. The whole speech is not printed. Only about half of the speech is printed. Regarding the editorial, I learnt that since the printed speech contained what is called the headings,—various policies of the Government are noted by way of headings in the margin—he has taken advantage of it and just dictated the editorial. What I learnt was that by the time the other matter was composed, he was able to get the editorial also composed, and printed simultaneously. Probably, the very first few copies he was able to print have been rushed to the premises of this building and it may be and he says it was, at 3 P.M. I cannot vouchsafe that it was 3 P.M., 3-5 P.M. or 3-10 P.M. I do not enter into dispute over this matter.

(SRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA.)

Therefore, the possibility of a portion of the speech being printed and an editorial also being printed within the course of one hour and forty minutes or fifty minutes, as the case may be, does not raise suspicion to the extent that some Hon'ble Members entertain. Apart from this fact, the right point at issue is that at 2-30 P.M. it became a public property and afterwards nobody can be accused of committing a breach of privilege of this House if publication is done, as I said, either by word of mouth or by mechanical aid or by printing. Therefore, in my opinion, there is no *prima facie* case because legally the point is very clear. Regarding the suspicion that the Government might have handed over a copy of this document to the concerned editor or the printer as the case may be, I must categorically say it is untrue. Sri Rama Rao himself has made it clear that the speech was actually printed on the 3rd and myself got a copy of the printed speech for me to go through finally at about 8-30 A.M. yesterday. Therefore, it is unthinkable that Government was a party to this premature handing over of budgetary papers to any one else, and I myself, as the Hon'ble Member has said, am as jealous of guarding the rights of this House as other Members are. In fact, it ought to be so. If, I had felt that a breach of privilege had been committed, I would be the first to own it. All the suspicions arise on account of one factor. A convention has been built up for a very long time—and I am also told it is the same case with regard to other legislatures,—that, as soon as the Finance Minister begins making his speech, the printed copies of his speech are simultaneously distributed to the Members. If that is not done and if that convention is discontinued, may be, there will be no room for all these kinds of inferences. I have no objection if you give a ruling that hereafter in order to avoid such inferences and suspicions, copies must not be distributed simultaneously to any one and it is only after the speech is completely delivered that copies ought to be distributed. That would clear a great deal of misunderstanding which is responsible for this point being raised.

There is another point that was raised, namely, that the members of the House were supplied with copies at 3-30 P. M. So far as that aspect is concerned, Government have placed the copies at the disposal of the Legislature Secretariat in time and the Legislature Secretariat naturally do not distribute the copies when the speech is being read in the House. Tbat would create a great deal of disturbance. As you are aware,—you have been a member of Parliament and you have been a Member of this Legislature—these copies are distributed after the speech is delivered. Therefore, whether the papers are actually delivered a little late is not the question here. When the Members hear the speech, they will have been in possession of it. The physical delivery of the printed material is not the question involved. Even if it is late or a little earlier, it does not constitute a breach of privilege. If the printed material had been handed over to somebody before the beginning of the delivery of the speech on the floor of the House, then, it would constitute a privilege. The Members in this instance, according to me, were the very first to hear the speech and no breach of privilege is therefore involved.

* ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪ (ಚೆನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ನಾಯಕರು ಏನು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದು ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ಆಗಿದೆಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕು. ಭಾಷಣ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಯಾರ ವಶಕ್ಕಾದರೂ ಈ ಭಾಷಣದ ಕಾಪಿ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿತ್ತೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬ ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ investigate ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಭಾಷಣ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಯಿತು. ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾದಮೇಲೆ ಅದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜನರ ಕೈ ಸೇರುವಂತೆ public property ಆಯಿತು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. 3 ಗಂಟೆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ Paper ಪ್ರಕಟ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದರೆ 2 ಗಂಟೆಯೊಳಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನೂ compose ಮಾಡಿ editorial ಬರೆದು print ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹಿಂದೆ ಅವರ ಕೈಗೆ ಆ ಭಾಷಣ ಸೇರಿತ್ತೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು investigate ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆಗ privilege ಇದೆಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು investigate ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. *Prima facie* ಆ ಪ್ರತಿಕೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅದು ಕೈಯ್ಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪೊಳೆಯನ್ನು ಜೋಡಿನತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಆಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಷ್ಟು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಖಂಡಿತ ವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲಪೆಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ನನಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ಹೌದೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ನಡೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ suspicion ಬಂದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದು ಬಹಳ serious matter ಎಂಬತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವಾಗ, ಇಷ್ಟರಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ನಡೆದಿರ ತಕ್ಕುದನ್ನು ನಾವು privilege ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟದ್ದಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುವುದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಘನತೆಗೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗಲಾರದೆಂದು ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Just now, I am coming from the other House. There was a similar motion moved and I am glad to say that the Chairman said that there was no breach of privilege in that House.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Can the decision of one House be announced in this House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—He has just given the information.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It is of academic interest. I want to know whether the Hon'ble Minister for Education has conveyed this decision in support of himself and the Government just to influence the decision of this House.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Because similar motions have been tabled, the Hon'ble Minister merely gave the information. It is far from our intention that it should bind you or the House.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—You are taking some time to give the decision. Where was the necessity for the Hon'ble Law Minister to announce the decision of the Upper House to this House now?

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—The House must be fully informed of both your point of view, the point of view of the Legislative Council and the point of view of others.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Indirectly, the suggestion is that that course might be followed here.

***Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T.-Narasipur).—Sir, the Hon'ble Chief Minister was pleased to say that it was only a notice given by a Member. I may be permitted to place before this House that under Rule 173 sub-clause (1), this is a motion. It cannot be an item or a notice. It is a motion. Secondly, I also heard the Hon'ble Chief Minister saying that it was possible to get the matter published in the Press composed in about one hour and fifty minutes. That may be true. But the point is, was this Press equipped with that machinery that will cope with the work in the said period; if the press was not equipped with the machinery that could compose the material that has been published in the period as was ascertained by the Chief Minister, then we would like to know whether the copy of the speech had been supplied to the Press much earlier than 1 p.m. Granting that the advance copies were supplied at 1-10 p.m. according to the Hon'ble Chief Minister, then the Press had only one hour and fifty minutes for composing, printing and despatching copies to the premises of this House. So, I would like to know whether the copies of the speech had been supplied much earlier than 1 p.m. or not. We have every right to feel or infer that it must have been done so. Otherwise, it is physically impossible to see that the whole matter is composed and printed and published and the copies rushed to this place, as it is done now. So, Sir, it is very necessary, that the matter should be investigated.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ—ಹೊಸನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಹಾಗೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಿಷ್ಟೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಿನ ಆಯವ್ಯಯದ ವರದಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ 1 ಘಂಟೆಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಲು ಆರಂಭಿಸಿದರು. ಅದು ಮುಗಿಯುವ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು $2\frac{1}{4}$ ಗಂಟೆಯಾಯಿತು. ಮತ್ತು 3 ಗಂಟೆಯ ಹೊತ್ತಿಗೆ Daily Post ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ತನ್ನ ಒಂದು ಸಂಪಾದಕೀಯದೊಡನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗೆ ಸೇರಿತು. ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದಂಥ ಶ್ರೀಮರ್ಣಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್‌ರವರು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಅಂತಹ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು $\frac{3}{4}$ ಗಂಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಚ್ಚು ಹಾಕಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿನತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ನವೀನ ಯಂತ್ರ ಸಿದ್ಧತೆ ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗೆ ಇದೆಯೇ ಎಂಬುದು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಷಯ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.)

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಓದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡಿದ ತಕ್ಷಣ ಅಚ್ಚಾದ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯವರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೂ ಹಂಚುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಇಷ್ಟು ಅಲ್ಪಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಅಚ್ಚು ಹಾಕಿ ಹೊರತರುವುದು ಊಹಿಸಲೂ ಅಸಾಧ್ಯ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪವೂ ಸಂದೇಹವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಚೈಪ್ ಆದ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟೇ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಇನ್ನೂ ಯಾರಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂತೂ, ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಅವರು ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನೊಂದು privilege motion ಆಗಿ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—The Hon'ble Law Minister has told us something what happened in the Upper House yesterday. The question hour of the Legislative Council is between 1 P.M. to 2 P.M. I don't think this privilege motion was moved and discussed in that House. The Hon'ble Minister might have said something. Yesterday the member who pointed out that there was a motion of privilege did not give it in writing and hence the speaker according to the report of the 'Deccan Herald' stated that there was nothing of that sort. This is according to the paper version. If there is any mistake in that, it may be corrected.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮೇಲಿನ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ privilege motion ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದು, ಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ ನಾನು ಬಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಇನ್ನೂ ಅನುಮಾನ ಪಡುವುದಾದರೆ, ಇಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಇನ್ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಕೊಡುವುದೋ, ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಈ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮಾತ್ರ ನಡೆದದ್ದೇ ಅಥವಾ ಹಿಂದೆಯೂ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದುದೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತ. 1950ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಸಂಗವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವಹಾಗೆ, ಆಗಿನ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೆಲವುಕಾಲ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಅದು ಸರಿಯೇ ಎಂಬ ವಿಷಯ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿತ್ತು. 21ನೆಯ ಮಾರ್ಚಿ 50ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯ L. A. ಪೊ ಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ 136 ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಭಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನು ಓದುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾಂರವರೇ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೆತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಿದೆ :

This is at page 136 dated 21st March 1950 proceedings.

"**Mushir-ul-Mulk J. MOHAMED IMAM** (Chitaldrug *cum* Tumkur. Muslim).—Mr. Speaker, before taking up the next item of business on the agenda, I would like to make a representation to the Chair. To-day is a very important day, being the day for the presentation of the Budget and it is a very important work. I do not know what the procedure is. Till now, neither the Financial Memorandum nor the Budget is supplied to us and we are handicapped. I do not know when the Hon'ble the Finance Minister will lay them on the table. More than ourselves, I think, the public are very anxious to know the details as early as possible. The only source through which they can get the particulars is to-day's or tomorrow's newspaper. I understand that copies of the Budget and the Memorandum are not made available to the Press in time . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER (Sri V. Venkatappa).—Before the Speech of the Finance Minister, Budgets are not published.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It was also learnt that they were made available to the foreign papers whereas the local press correspondents were denied the privilege. I am not concerned about foreign Press; I am concerned only with the Press of my place. The Budget, I submit, ought to have been made available to the Press as early as possible to enable them to publish the details in to-day's papers. I am not finding fault with any one. The Budget speech and other things may be given to them in time so that they may appear as far as possible in the local press, much earlier than in other foreign newspapers.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಸಚಿವರು ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯು ಮುಂದಿದಹೊರತು ಅಥವಾ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಹಂಚುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಂಚಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—But I am told that copies have been given to the foreign papers.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Is it a fact that Budget copies are given to some newspapers before the Members got it?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Will the Hon'ble Speaker please enquire and let us know? I am reliably informed that a particular paper has been supplied with a copy and other papers have been denied and no Member has been supplied with a copy so far.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Who has given it?

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The Finace Minister, I am told.

Sri H. C. DASAPPA (Minister for Finance and Industries).—Now, that my Hon'ble friend the Leader of the Opposition, has raised certain points, it is best that they are answered.

As regards the first, the Hon'ble Speaker has already told him that copies of the Budget can only be made available after the Budget has been introduced by the Finance Minister. So, I think, I do not need to dwell on that. I thought the Hon'ble Member opposite knew this new procedure very well.

Janab J. MOHAMED IMAM.—This is the first time; how can we know?

Sri H. C. DASAPPA.—Anyway, now that he has known, I think that objection does not stand.

The second thing is with regard to making available the copies of my speech. I think, I owe a statement to this House with regard to this. I was definitely given to understand that the copies of the speech, just a few hours before it is made, can be circulated among the Press with an embargo that they shall not be opened prior to the time of speech. They have got to note that practice, and when a number of Press friends saw me on this point, I gave them to understand that on condition that they give me this promise, namely, that they shall not open it prior to the time of making my speech, I should have no objection to do so, having set my own seal for the seal of the office on the cover carrying the speech. It so happened, Sir, that when one of the journalists saw me by no means a foreign journalist in the sense—he is as much Indian as anybody is—there was a kind of hashed portion, incomplete portion of the speech available at the time. Since that was a paper outside Mysore and the latest hour for despatch of the speech copy was 2 P.M. to-day and it could not reacht he destination before 5 P.M., arrangement was made to seal the cover and give it to him so hat it may reach the destination by 5 or 5-30 P.M. whatever it may be."

Now, Sir, the most important thing in this particular case is, if the newspaper had published it prior to 1 P. M. there would have been a breach of privilege. If it is published subsequently, we are not here to say as to what equipments he has got; whether he can do it or not; whether his staff is capable of printing or not. We are not here to enquire into all these things. I do not think there is any breach of privilege.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—The front page of the Budget Speech carries an instruction in red letters, "Not to be published till 3 p.m. on Thursday, the 3rd March 1955". It says 'not to be published till 3 p.m.' Just now the Hon'ble Law Minister said that there was prohibition not to publish it prior to 1 p.m. But in fact the instructions contained are like that. The instruction read as follows:—

"Not to be published till 3 p. m on Thursday the 3rd March 1955".

I wanted to correct that position. When this speech should not be published till 3 p.m., how did the Press get it and publish it much earlier than it is presented to the House? How is it that the press can publish it in so short a time near the Assembly premises? I am just trying

(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)

to have the correct picture. I am not blaming anybody. I want to know how it can happen and how this thing happened in this particular case ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.— On a point of clarification. The direction given there is just to adjust the work of the publication and the procedure in this House. It was expected that about 2 hours might be taken by the Finance Minister to finish his speech; and therefore that time was prescribed. But when he finishsd it, whether at 2 o'Clock or 3 o' clock or 3-30, nothing prevents either the public who are assembled here or the Press to make use of the materials given out directly by the Finance Minister. This direction serves no purpose because of its earlier publication; and if this is made use of what is the harm there ? We have got to transact certain business in the normal manner. If the whole thing has been published within few hours,—it is a matter which carries very little value.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.— Let the Chair decide now. We have placed the matter before him.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಆರ್. ನಾಯಿಡು (ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರಂ).— ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತೂ ಈ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಮರಾಯರೂ ಮತ್ತು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಇಮಾಂರವರೂ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳವಿಷಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವ ಮೊದಲು ಒಂದು ಸಂದೇಹ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಈ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ printing ಇಷ್ಟು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆಯಾಗಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ, ಎರಡೇ ಗಂಟೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಮುದ್ರಣ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಆ ಪ್ರಿಂಟಿಂಗ್ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ, ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆಯಲ್ಲಿ compose ಮಾಡಿ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ time ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಗೆ ತಡೆಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್ (ನೆಲಮಂಗಲ—ಅನುಸೂಚಿತ ಜಾತಿಗಳು).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಮರಾಯರು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಭೆಗೂ, ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರಿಗೂ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಸಭೆಯವರು ಹೇಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದು ನನಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಯಿತು. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಪ್ಪು ಮಾಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತೇಜನ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲೂ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕವರಲ್ಲ.

ಈಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿಂದೆ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಸಂಗವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಗೌರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಪ್ರಿಂಟಿಂಗ್ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳು ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಹೊರಬಿದ್ದುವೆಂಬ ಕಾರಣದಮೇಲೆ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಗಳನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಲಾಯಿತು. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಒಂದು enquiry ನಡೆಯಿತು. ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟವರಿಗೆ ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಯೂ ಆಯಿತು. ಅದರಂತೆಯೇ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು.

Breach of privilege ಎಂಬುದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟುದು. ಜನರು ಎಣ್ಣೆ ದೀಪದ ಸಹಾಯದಿಂದ ಊಟ ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲವಿತ್ತು; ಈಗ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ ದೀಪಗಳ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಇದ್ದರೂ ನಮಗೆ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಷ್ಟು ಮಂಕುಗಳು ನಾವಲ್ಲ. ಆ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯವರು ಇಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಪಬ್ಲಿಷ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಸಂತೋಷವೇ. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವರಲ್ಲ ತಕ್ಕ ಸಲಕರಣೆಗಳಿತ್ತೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಮಾಡಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೇ ಬಿಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಬೇಗ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ breach of privilege ಆಗಿದ್ದರೇ ಯಾರೂ ಸಹಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲ. If there is truth in the motion of privilege, the person concerned is punishable. ಈಗ ಸದಸ್ಯರನೇಕರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ breach of privilege ನಡೆದಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಅನುಮಾನ ಹುಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನ್ಯಾಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕವರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು investigate ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರು.—ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯೇ ಇದೆಯಲ್ಲಾ! ಅವರೇ ಇದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪ್ರಭಾಕರ್.—ಈಗ ಅನುಮಾನ ಬಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯ. ಅದನ್ನು ತಾತ್ಸಾರ ಮಾಡಿಬಿಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದುವೇಳೆ ನಿಜ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೆ ಯಾರು ಕಾರಣರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪತ್ತೆ ಹಚ್ಚೋಣ. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡದೆ, ಈಗಿನ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

2 P.M.

ಹಾಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ತೂಕ ಹಾಕಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಇದು ನಡೆದಿರಬಹುದೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಖಚಿತವಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲು, ಈ ಸಭೆಯಮುಂದೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.— I will give the decision next day. Now we shall take up the consideration of the report of the Fact Finding Committee (States Re-organisation).